

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUL 12 2006

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Amendments were made to the specification to correct errors and to clarify the specification. No new matter has been added by any of the amendments to the specification.

Claims 1-21 are pending in the present application. By this response claims 1, 3, 5-7, 10, 11, 13, 15-17, 20 and 21 are amended. Reconsideration of the claims in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

**I. Examiner Interview**

Applicants thank Examiner Savla for contacting Applicants representative on June 27, 2006. Examiner Savla contacted Applicants' representative through voicemail stating he would not grant an interview because the issues submitted by Applicants' representatives were covered in a prior interview on a related case. The agenda submitted June 22, 2006, included proposed amendments to overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection and the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejections. Examiner Savla stated if the amendment to claim 11 was in accordance with the prior suggestions, the amendment would overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection. Examiner Savla additionally stated the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph were minor and if his suggestions stated in the Office Action were followed, those amendments would overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejections.

**II. Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicants thank Examiner Savla for indicating the subject matter of claims 1-21 allowable. By this response, claims 1, 3, 5-7, 10, 11, 13, 15-17, 20, and 21 amended in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection and the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejections. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submits the subject application is now in condition for allowance.

**III. 35 U.S.C. § 101**

The Office rejects claims 11-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed towards non-statutory subject matter. By this response, claim 11 is amended to recite "A computer program product in a recordable-type computer readable medium..."

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 11 is statutory. Thus, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 11 and 12-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

**IV. 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph**

The Office rejects claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter, which applicants regard as the invention. By this response, claims 1, 11, and 21 are amended to recite "a contents of the cache line." Claims 3 and 13 are amended to recite "the code of the computer program." Claims 5, 6, 10, 15, 16, and 20 are amended to recite "the reload." Claims 6, 7, 16, and 17 are amended to recite "a value of the first processor flag bit." Therefore, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

**V. Objection to Claims**

The Office objects to claims 1-21 as allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph and 35 U.S.C. § 101. In response, the claims have been rewritten to overcome this objection.

**VI. Conclusion**

It is respectfully urged that the subject application is patentable over the prior art of record and is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the Examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: July 12, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

Francis Lammes

Francis Lammes  
Reg. No. 55,353  
Yee & Associates, P.C.  
P.O. Box 802333  
Dallas, TX 75380  
(972) 385-8777  
Agent for Applicants